

concludes that the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process such as “the top layer could be peeled off via a die cutting operation, by using manual force, or by using some sort of acidic or basic solution for removal of the top layer.” However, the Office has not provided reasons and/or examples to support this conclusion. Further, the Office has failed to show that the proposed use is materially different from the claimed use.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the Office has failed to meet the burden necessary in order to sustain the Restriction Requirement. Withdrawal of the Restriction Requirement is respectfully requested.

Further, MPEP §803 states as follows:

If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on its merits, even though it includes claims to distinct or independent inventions.

Applicants submit that a search of all claims would not constitute a serious burden on the Office.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants contend that the Restriction Requirement is improper and should be withdrawn.

Additionally, MPEP §821.04 states:

...if applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims which depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined.

Applicants respectfully submit that should the elected group be found allowable, non-elected process claims should be rejoined.

Applicants respectfully submit that the above-identified application is now in condition for examination on the merits, and early notice of such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Norman F. Oblon
Attorney of Record
Registration No.: 24,618

Vincent K. Shier, Ph.D.
Registration No.: 50,552



22850

PHONE NO.: (703) 413-3000
FAX NO.: (703) 413-2220
NFO:VKS
I:\atty\VKS\215204US0X-RR resp.wpd